

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

The claims have been amended by rewriting Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24. Claims 1-7 and 9-28 remain in the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks and arguments.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA). Applicants traverse these rejections. To anticipate a claim, a reference must teach each element of the claim. M.P.E.P. 2131. Applicants submit that the AAPA of this application does not anticipate amended Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24 as it fails to teach each limitation recited in these claims and included by dependency in Claims 2-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16 and 18-23.

The Examiner correctly suggested that Applicants made an error during their previous claim amendments. As their previous argument supports, Applicants intended to amend Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24 to add the limitation that the PCU comprises "*at least one program address register.*" Applicants have now corrected this error, so that each of these claims includes this language. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the AAPA, i.e., Fig. 1, of this application does not anticipate Applicants' invention as it fails to teach or suggest this italicized limitation.

Figs. 3-5, each illustrating an embodiment of the PCU of the present invention, show the PCU as including at least one program address register. The specification at page 9, lines 10-13 and page 11, lines 21-29 further supports these amendments to Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24. Conversely, the general peripheral device 300 in Fig. 1 that the Examiner identifies as a PCU, is not the PCU claimed in amended Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24 because device 300 clearly fails to comprise at least one program address register as recited in these claims.

Thus, for all of the reasons above, Applicants submit that the AAPA of this application does not anticipate amended Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24. Therefore Claims 1, 11, 14, 17 and 24 are now in a condition for allowance, and Claims 2-7, 9-10, 12-13, 15-16, 18-23 and 25-28 that depend from and include all of the limitations of their respective independent claims are likewise in a condition for allowance for all of the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any

claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 502117.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Valerie M. Davis

Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 50,203

Telephone: (847) 576-6733
Fax No.: (847) 576-0721

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
1303 E. Algonquin Road
Law Department
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917